

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 05-6238

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

SYLVIA ANITA RYAN-WEBSTER,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. T. S. Ellis, III, District Judge. (CR-02-60-A; CA-04-489-1)

Submitted: August 31, 2005

Decided: September 12, 2005

Before WILLIAMS, TRAXLER, and KING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Sylvia Anita Ryan-Webster, Appellant Pro Se. Robert Charles Erickson, Jr., Thomas Higgins McQuillan, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Sylvia Anita Ryan-Webster, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on her motion filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that the district court's assessment of his constitutional claims is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir. 2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Ryan-Webster has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny the motion for appointment of counsel and dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED